

REMARKS

Claims 1-4 and 35-48 are currently pending in the subject application. Claim 2 has been amended herein in order to more particularly point out and distinctly claim subject matter. The Applicants respectfully submit that no new matter has been added. It is believed that this paper is fully responsive to the Office Action dated August 23, 2011.

1. The Examiner has rejected claims 1 and 3511 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,076,543 (Johnson).

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection, for the following reasons.

There are substantial, important differences between the art relied upon by the Examiner and the combinations of features as set forth in the claims.

The U.S. Patent and Trademark Office has the burden of proof to show that an applicant is not entitled to a patent if the claimed subject matter is anticipated by, or is obvious from, the art of record. A patent applicant is entitled to a patent unless the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office establishes otherwise.

In the Decision on Appeal, dated July 12, 2011, the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences indicated that "**Johnson** does not disclose by a preponderance of the evidence that

the unillustrated rail permits a line supporting rail to be slidably mounted, relative to other line supporting rails, in a direction orthogonal to the unillustrated rail" (page 4).

The Examiner has acknowledged that "**Johnson** does not disclose that the gas lines are slidably mounted on the transverse rails" (Office Action, page 3, lines 7-8).

Also, the Examiner has attempted to show that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide slidable adjustability.

However, the Examiner has not persuasively demonstrated that it would have been obvious to modify **Johnson** to arrive at features corresponding to "each line supporting rail being slidably mounted on the at least one orthogonal rail relative to other of said line supporting rails" (emphasis added).

In the subject application, each line supporting rail is slidably mounted on the at least one orthogonal rail, and each line supporting rail is slidably mounted relative to other line supporting rails.

Johnson fails to describe, teach, or suggest the combination of features recited in claim 1 including at least the following features: "each line supporting rail being slidably mounted on the at least one orthogonal rail relative to other of said line supporting rails."

Response filed November 22, 2011

Reply to OA dated August 23, 2011

Accordingly, in view of the above, Applicants respectfully submit that this rejection of claim 1 is improper and should be withdrawn. Also, it is submitted that this rejection of claim 35/1 should be withdrawn by virtue of its dependency.

2. The Examiner has rejected claims 1 and 35/1, in the alternative, and claims 2-4, 35/2-4, 37-42, and 44-48 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,076,543 (Johnson) as modified above in view of Itoh.

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection, for the following reasons.

There are substantial, important differences between the art relied upon by the Examiner and the combinations of features as set forth in the claims.

The U.S. Patent and Trademark Office has the burden of proof to show that an applicant is not entitled to a patent if the claimed subject matter is anticipated by, or is obvious from, the art of record. A patent applicant is entitled to a patent unless the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office establishes otherwise.

Johnson and **Itoh**, alone or in combination, fail to describe, teach, or suggest the combination of features recited in claim 1 including at least the following features: "each line supporting rail being slidably mounted on the at least one orthogonal rail relative to other of said line supporting rails."

Johnson and **Itoh**, alone or in combination, fail to describe, teach, or suggest the combination of features recited in claim 2, as amended, including at least the following features: "each line support member is slidably mounted on the at least one orthogonal rail relative to other of said line support members."

Johnson and **Itoh**, alone or in combination, fail to describe, teach, or suggest the combination of features recited in claim 3 including at least the following features: "the plurality of tracks being mounted on the at least one orthogonal rail, each track of said plurality of tracks being slideable along the at least one orthogonal rail relative to other of said tracks in a direction orthogonal to the lines after the tracks are mounted on the at least one orthogonal rail."

Johnson and **Itoh**, alone or in combination, fail to describe, teach, or suggest the combination of features recited in claim 4 including at least the following features: "the plurality of tracks being mounted on the at least one orthogonal rail, each track being slideable along the at least one orthogonal rail relative to other of said tracks in a direction orthogonal to the lines after the tracks are mounted on the at least one orthogonal rail."

Accordingly, in view of the above, Applicants respectfully submit that this rejection of claims 1-4 should be withdrawn. Also, it is submitted that this rejection of claim 35, 37-42, and 44-48 should be withdrawn by virtue of their dependency.

3. The Examiner has rejected claims 36 and 43 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,076,543 (**Johnson**) in view of **Itoh** as applied above and further in view of **Markulec**.

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection, for the following reasons.

There are substantial, important differences between the art relied upon by the Examiner and the combinations of features as set forth in the claims.

The U.S. Patent and Trademark Office has the burden of proof to show that an applicant is not entitled to a patent if the claimed subject matter is anticipated by, or is obvious from, the art of record. A patent applicant is entitled to a patent unless the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office establishes otherwise.

Markulec fails to remedy the above-described deficiencies of **Johnson** and **Itoh** regarding base claims 1-4. Claims 36 and 43 depend from one or more of claims 1-4.

Johnson, **Itoh**, and **Markulec**, alone or in combination, fail to describe, teach, or suggest the combination of features recited in claim 1 including at least the following features: "each line supporting rail being slidably mounted on the at least one orthogonal rail relative to other of said line supporting rails."

Johnson, Itoh, and Markulec, alone or in combination, fail to describe, teach, or suggest the combination of features recited in claim 2, as amended, including at least the following features: "each line support member is slidably mounted on the at least one orthogonal rail relative to other of said line support members."

Johnson, Itoh, and Markulec, alone or in combination, fail to describe, teach, or suggest the combination of features recited in claim 3 including at least the following features: "the plurality of tracks being mounted on the at least one orthogonal rail, each track of said plurality of tracks being slideable along the at least one orthogonal rail relative to other of said tracks in a direction orthogonal to the lines after the tracks are mounted on the at least one orthogonal rail."

Johnson, Itoh, and Markulec, alone or in combination, fail to describe, teach, or suggest the combination of features recited in claim 4 including at least the following features: "the plurality of tracks being mounted on the at least one orthogonal rail, each track being slideable along the at least one orthogonal rail relative to other of said tracks in a direction orthogonal to the lines after the tracks are mounted on the at least one orthogonal rail."

Accordingly, in view of the above, Applicants respectfully submit that this rejection of claims 36 and 43 should be withdrawn by virtue of their dependency.

Response filed November 22, 2011

Reply to OA dated August 23, 2011

4. The Examiner has rejected claims 1 and 35/1 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,076,543 (**Johnson**) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,394,138 (**Vu**).

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection, for the following reasons.

There are substantial, important differences between the art relied upon by the Examiner and the combinations of features as set forth in the claims.

The U.S. Patent and Trademark Office has the burden of proof to show that an applicant is not entitled to a patent if the claimed subject matter is anticipated by, or is obvious from, the art of record. A patent applicant is entitled to a patent unless the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office establishes otherwise.

The Examiner has suggested that it would have been obvious to use the rails taught by **Vu** with the system of **Johnson** "to provide support for the gas sticks" (Office Action dated August 23, 2011, page 5). However, the system of **Johnson** already provides support for the gas sticks (see Fig. 10). Thus, the Examiner has not shown a need or motivation to modify **Johnson**.

The Examiner has not persuasively shown why a person of ordinary skill in the art would modify the **Johnson** device with the teachings of **Vu**.

Response filed November 22, 2011

Reply to OA dated August 23, 2011

As noted above, in the Decision on Appeal dated July 12, 2011, the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences indicated that "**Johnson** does not disclose by a preponderance of the evidence that the unillustrated rail permits a line supporting rail to be slidably mounted, relative to other line supporting rails, in a direction orthogonal to the unillustrated rail" (page 4).

The Examiner has acknowledged that "**Johnson** does not disclose that the gas lines are slidably mounted on the transverse rails" (Office Action, page 3 and page 5).

The Examiner has not persuasively demonstrated how it could have been obvious to modify **Johnson** with the teachings of **Vu** to arrive at features corresponding to "each line supporting rail being slidably mounted on the at least one orthogonal rail relative to other of said line supporting rails."

In the subject application, each line supporting rail is slidably mounted on the at least one orthogonal rail, and each line supporting rail is slidably mounted relative to other line supporting rails.

Applicants respectfully submit that this rejection of claim 1 is improper and should be withdrawn. Also, it is submitted that this rejection of claim 35/1 should be withdrawn by virtue of its dependency.

5. The Examiner has rejected claims 1 and 35/1, in the alternative, and claims 2-4, 35/2-4, 37-42, and 44-48 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,076,543 (Johnson) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,394,138 (Vu) as applied above and further in view of Itoh.

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection, for the following reasons.

There are substantial, important differences between the art relied upon by the Examiner and the combinations of features as set forth in the claims.

The U.S. Patent and Trademark Office has the burden of proof to show that an applicant is not entitled to a patent if the claimed subject matter is anticipated by, or is obvious from, the art of record. A patent applicant is entitled to a patent unless the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office establishes otherwise.

The Examiner has suggested that it would have been obvious to use the rails taught by **Vu** with the system of **Johnson** "to provide support for the gas sticks." However, the system of **Johnson** already provides support for the gas sticks (see Fig. 10).

The Examiner has not persuasively shown why a person of ordinary skill in the art would modify the **Johnson** device with the teachings of **Vu** and of **Itoh**.

Response filed November 22, 2011

Reply to OA dated August 23, 2011

In the Decision on Appeal, dated July 12, 2011, the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences indicated that "**Johnson** does not disclose by a preponderance of the evidence that the unillustrated rail permits a line supporting rail to be slidably mounted, relative to other line supporting rails, in a direction orthogonal to the unillustrated rail" (page 4).

The Examiner has acknowledged that "**Johnson** does not disclose that the gas lines are slidably mounted on the transverse rails" (Office Action, page 3 and page 5).

The Examiner has not persuasively demonstrated how it could have been obvious to modify **Johnson** with the teachings of **Vu** and **Itoh** to arrive at features corresponding to "each line supporting rail being slidably mounted on the at least one orthogonal rail relative to other of said line supporting rails." In the subject application, each line supporting rail is slidably mounted on the at least one orthogonal rail, and each line supporting rail is slidably mounted relative to other line supporting rails.

Similar arguments can be made, and are applicable, regarding independent claims 2-4. Applicants respectfully submit that this rejection of claims 1-4 is improper and should be withdrawn. Also, it is submitted that this rejection of claims 35, 37-42, and 44-48 should be withdrawn by virtue of their dependency.

Response filed November 22, 2011

Reply to OA dated August 23, 2011

6. The Examiner has rejected claims 36 and 43 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,076,543 (**Johnson**) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,394,138 (**Vu**), and **Itoh** as applied above and further in view of **Markulec**.

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection, for the following reasons.

There are substantial, important differences between the art relied upon by the Examiner and the combinations of features as set forth in the claims.

The U.S. Patent and Trademark Office has the burden of proof to show that an applicant is not entitled to a patent if the claimed subject matter is anticipated by, or is obvious from, the art of record. A patent applicant is entitled to a patent unless the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office establishes otherwise.

Markulec fails to remedy the above-described deficiencies of those Examiner's rejections which rely on **Johnson**, **Vu**, and **Itoh**, regarding base claims 1-4. Claims 36 and 43 depend from one or more of claims 1-4.

Johnson, **Itoh**, and **Markulec**, alone or in combination, fail to describe, teach, or suggest the combination of features recited in claim 1 including at least the following features: "each line supporting rail being slidably mounted on the at least one orthogonal rail relative to other of said line supporting rails."

Johnson, Itoh, and Markulec, alone or in combination, fail to describe, teach, or suggest the combination of features recited in claim 2, as amended, including at least the following features: "each line support member is slidably mounted on the at least one orthogonal rail relative to other of said line support members."

Johnson, Itoh, and Markulec, alone or in combination, fail to describe, teach, or suggest the combination of features recited in claim 3 including at least the following features: "the plurality of tracks being mounted on the at least one orthogonal rail, each track of said plurality of tracks being slideable along the at least one orthogonal rail relative to other of said tracks in a direction orthogonal to the lines after the tracks are mounted on the at least one orthogonal rail."

Johnson, Itoh, and Markulec, alone or in combination, fail to describe, teach, or suggest the combination of features recited in claim 4 including at least the following features: "the plurality of tracks being mounted on the at least one orthogonal rail, each track being slideable along the at least one orthogonal rail relative to other of said tracks in a direction orthogonal to the lines after the tracks are mounted on the at least one orthogonal rail."

Accordingly, in view of the above, Applicants respectfully submit that this rejection of claims 36 and 43 should be withdrawn by virtue of their dependency.

If, for any reason, it is felt that this application is not now in condition for allowance, the

U.S. Patent Application Serial No.: **09/893,522**

Response filed November 22, 2011

Reply to OA dated August 23, 2011

Examiner is requested to contact the Applicants' undersigned attorney at the telephone number indicated below to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this case.

In the event that this paper is not timely filed, the applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. Please charge any fees for such an extension of time and any other fees which may be due with respect to this paper, to Deposit Account No. 01-2340.

Respectfully submitted,

KRATZ, QUINTOS & HANSON, LLP



Darren Crew
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 37,806

DC/kn

Atty. Docket No. **010846**
4th Floor
1420 K Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005
(202) 659-2930



23850
PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE